

No. 981-4Lab-76/5445.—In pursuance of the provisions of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Haryana, Rohtak in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s. Chopra Motors (P) Ltd., Mirthal.

BEFORE SHRI MOHAN LAL JAIN, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, ROHTAK

Reference No. 30 of 1975

between

SHRI VIJAY BAHADUR SINGH WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S CHOPRA MOTORS (P) LTD., MURTHAL.

AWARD

By order No. ID/RK/285-B-74/25539, dated 14th May, 1975, the Governor of Haryana, referred the following dispute between the management of M/s Chopra Motors (P) Ltd., Mirthal and its workman Shri Vijay Bahadur Singh to this Labour Court, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Whether the termination of services of Shri Vijay Bahadur Singh was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

Whereas the management put in their appearance on 5th January, 1976 in response to the usual notices of reference sent to them, the workman did not appear on that date despite service of such notice with the result that he was proceeded with ex-parte.

Shri S. S. Kohli, Personnel Manager of the respondent made an *ex parte* statement on that date, that the workman resigned his job,—*vide* resignation Exhibit M-1 submitted by him in writing under his signatures.

I see no reason to disbelieve the statement of Shri S. S. Kohli particularly when the proceedings against the workman are *ex parte* and he has taken no care to pursue the demand raised by him on the management leading to this reference.

I thus relying on the statement of Shri S. S. Kohli hold that the workman resigned his job and his services were not terminated by the management and that he is not entitled to any relief. I accordingly answer the reference while returning the award in terms of my findings made above.

MOHAN LAL JAIN,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Rohtak.

No. 994-4Lab-76/5447.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Haryana, Rohtak in respect of the dispute between the workmen and management of M/S. Dikki Pharmastical Industries, (P) Ltd., Bahadurgarh.

BEFORE SHRI MOHAN LAL JAIN, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, ROHTAK

Reference No. 94 of 1975

between

SHRI HARDEV SINGH WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S DIKKI PHARMASTICAL INDUSTRIES, (P) LTD., BAHADURGARH

AWARD

By order No. ID/RK/75/64525, dated 17th October, 1975 the Governor of Haryana, referred the following dispute between the management of M/s. Dikki Pharmastical Industries, (P) Ltd., Bahadurgarh

and its workman Shri Harden Singh to this Labour Court, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Harden Singh was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

Whereas the workmen put in his appearance on 5th December, 1975 in response to the usual notices of reference sent to him, the management did not appear on that date despite being served with such a notice with the result that they were proceeded with *ex parte*. The workman made an *ex parte* statement on 6th January, 1975 that his services as a Garinder on wages of Rs. 175/- P. M. had been unjustly terminated by the management on 11th March, 1976 without assigning any reason or service of any charge-sheet on him. He added that he remained unemployed and could not find the job despite efforts made by him after the date of termination of his services.

I see no reason to disbelieve the statement of the workman particularly when the proceedings against the management are *ex parte* and they have not taken care to defend the demand leading to this reference. I accordingly relying on the statement of the workman hold that the termination of his services by the workman was unjustified and that he is entitled to be reinstated with continuity of service and full back wages.

I accordingly answer the reference and return the award in terms of my findings made above.

MOHAN LAL JAIN,

Dated, the 15th January, 1976.

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Rohtak.

No. 995-4Lab-76/5449.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Haryana, Rohtak in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s Rajindra Weaving Factory, 14/4 Bahalgarh Road, Sonepat.

BEFORE SHRI MOHAN LAL JAIN, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, ROHTAK
Reference No. 83 of 1974

between

SHRI DATA RAM, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S RAJINDRA WEAVING
FACTORY, 14/4, BAHALGARH ROAD, SONEPAT

AWARD

By order No. ID/RK/185-C-74/36175, dated 31st October, 1974 the Governor of Haryana, referred the following dispute between the management of M/s. Rajindra Weaving Factory, 14/4, Bahalgarh Road, Sonepat and its workman Shri Data Ram to this Labour Court, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Data Ram was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

Whereas the management put in their appearance on 6th January, 1976 in response to the usual notices of reference sent to them, the workman did not appear on that date despite being served with such a notice with the result that he was proceeded with *ex parte*. Shri P. N. Bhatia, Manager of the respondent made an *ex parte* statement on the aforesaid date, that their factory had been closed on 1st November, 1974 and remained closed since that date and no work was being done therein.

I see no reason to disbelieve the statement of Shri P. N. Bhatia, particularly when the proceedings against the workman are *ex parte* and he had not taken care to pursue the demand raised by him on the management leading to this reference. I accordingly rely on the statement of Shri P. N. Bhatia and hold that the reference received on 6th November, 1974 after the factory had been closed is bad in law and the workman is not entitled to any relief. I, therefore, answer the reference and return the award in terms of my findings made above.

MOHAN LAL JAIN,

Dated the 12th January, 1976.

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Rohtak.